

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to FIGS. 1a, 1b, to 4a, 4b, such that FIG. 1a is printed on a separate page from FIG. 1b, and so on for all of the figures such that Figures “a” and “b” are printed on a separate pages as suggested by the Examiner.

Attachment: Replacement sheet

REMARKS

The Examiner has interpreted the limitation “magneto-optical (MO) type media” in a manner such that it includes “any media capable of being used in apparatus utilizing a magnetic head and some manner of optical/thermal affect ... i.e. all known magnetic recording media” as stated on page 2 line 3 from the bottom to page 3, line 1, of the Action. The term “magneto-optical media” is well known in the art and has also been defined in the specification as media that “uses laser beams to write and read information to the MO media or disk. The MO storage system operates on the principle of Curie temperature and Kerr effect as opposed to the magnetic resistance principles of MR storage systems.” See page 2, lines 14-17. All known magnetic recording media are *not* capable of being written on with data and read by a laser beam, and do *not* operate on the principle of Curie temperature and Kerr effect. Thus, the Examiner’s *alleged* “broadest reasonable interpretation(s) consistent with the written description in applicant’s specification” (see page 2, paragraph 2, lines 2 and 3, of the Action) is clearly *not* consistent with the written description in applicant’s specification. In any case, in order to limit the term “magneto-optical (MO) media” to be narrower than “all known magnetic recording media” as has been interpreted by the Examiner, claim 1 has been amended to specifically recite “wherein the MO media is a perpendicular media and capable of being read using a laser beam.”

The amendment of claim 1 is supported by the text on page 2, lines 14 and 15 of the specification. The amendment of new claims 17 and 18 are supported by a limitation of original claim 14 and the text on page 10, line 19 of the specification, respectively.

The objection of claims 3, 7 and 8 has been overcome as by using the terms “soft magnetic layer” and “hard magnetic layer” as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed and has been overcome by amending claims 15 in a manner that the Examiner considers the claim to be enabled by the specification.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 9 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed and should be overcome by the amendments of these claims.

Claims 1 and 12 were rejected as being anticipated by Lambeth. Claims 14 and 15 were rejected as being obvious over Lambeth in view of Tang. Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as being obvious over Nakajima in view of Lambeth and Osato. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13 and 16 were rejected as being obvious over Nakajima in view of Lambeth, Osato and Knight. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In making all of these rejections the Examiner has assumed that the term “magneto-optical (MO)-media” includes “all known magnetic recording media.” This is clearly incorrect, particularly in light of the limitation in claim 1 that “the MO media is a perpendicular media and capable of being read using a laser beam.” Please note that “all known magnetic recording media” are *not* capable of being read using a laser beam. This fact is well-known to persons of ordinary skill in this art. In short, none of the cited references alone or in combination disclose a storage system comprising both a magnetic head having a MR sensor and a MO media “wherein the MO media is a perpendicular media and capable of being read using a laser beam, and further wherein the storage system is a hybrid recording device wherein said magnetic head comprising the MR sensor reads and writes data on said MO media” was recited in claim 1.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. **03-1952** referencing docket no.146712015500.

Dated: August 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Raj S. Davé

Registration No.: 42,465

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20006-1888

(703) 760-7755 887-1500

Attachments